REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of October 5, 2007 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-15, and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,069,560 to Cheyer, *et al.* (hereinafter Cheyer).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants have amended the claims so as to expedite prosecution of the present application by emphasizing certain aspects of the invention. However, such amendments should not be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter, and Applicants expressly reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 7, 12, and 18 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is method for managing distributed multimodal interactions.

The method can include registering a plurality of distributed modality components

8

with a modality component server, wherein each modality component handles an interface modality for an application, wherein each modality component places a set of activation conditions in a shared memory area of the modality component server, wherein the set of activation conditions defines how the modality component can be activated, and how input and output between the modality component a client device can be started and stopped, wherein the modality component can be activated whenever one of the set of activation conditions is detected, and wherein activation conditions can be added or removed by an application module (see, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0049] and step 305 of Fig. 3 as well as paragraphs [0007] to [0010]).

The method also can include initiating a multimodal application from a client device, the multimodal application submitting activation conditions for modality components it supports to a multimodal engine of the modality component server (see, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0050] and step 308 of Fig. 3).

The method further can include matching the activation conditions submitted by the multimodal application with activation conditions stored in the shared memory area by an inference engine of the modality component server, activating a modality component by a modality activator of modality component server when one of the set of activation conditions for the modality component is satisfied, and connecting the activated modality component to the client device (see, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0050] and steps 309-312 of Fig. 3).

The method additionally can include conveying a user interaction from the client device to the activated modality component for processing and disconnecting the activated modality component from the client device and deactivating the modality component by the modality activator upon completion of an interaction response (see, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0010]).

9

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

As discussed in the previous response, Cheyer does not disclose submitting the activation conditions for modality components supported by a multimodal application to the multimodal engine or dynamically comparing the submitted activation conditions with the set of activation conditions stored in the shared memory area, thus automatically activating or deactivating required modality component(s) based on an initiation or completion of the multimodal application without specific request by the client device. In Cheyer, the client request has to be first received and then processed though multiple steps in order for an appropriate agent to be found. In Cheyer, the server cannot automatically activate or deactivate an agent merely based on the initiation or completion of a multimodal application. The independent claims have been modified to even more clearly define the present invention and support the above argument.

Applicants, therefore, believe that the present invention is patentable over Cheyer. In view of the forgoing, Applicants respectfully request that the claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

The entry of the amendment is requested because the modification is made for the mere purpose of clarification. No new subject matter has been introduced and thus no new search should be required.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheyer, in view of U.S. Patent 6,859,451 to Pasternack, *et al.* (hereinafter Pasternack).

Claims 5 and 16 are believed to be patentable because they are dependent on independent claims 1 and 12, which are believed to be patentable as discussed above. Applicants thus respectfully request that the claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: <u>December 5, 2007</u>

/Richard A. Hinson/
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

11